

worth defending. Again, I am grateful for the Veterans of Foreign Wars Congressional Award. I am honored to accept it on behalf of all Members of Congress and all citizens of the Nation who foster the American spirit in war and in peace. I thank you.

Where's U.S. Prestige?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in his book "The 20 Years Crisis," author Carr purports that the basic problem of utopian theories for world peace lies in the fact that none of these theories recognize the forces of change as a necessary element in the conduct of world and human events.

It is time we recognized the forces of change and channel them into peaceful and constructive directions. A free enterprise system such as we have in this country is a system which must allow change to take place in a constructive and orderly manner rather than attempting to keep the lid on the boiling pot until it results in an explosion.

The damage of ignoring these forces is evident in recent events which have occurred throughout the world indicating that U.S. foreign policy is in need of some constructive changes.

I submit for inclusion here an editorial from the January 20 issue of the *Fredrick (Md.) News* which clearly points out the seriousness of the situation:

WHERE'S U.S. PRESTIGE?

There hasn't been much said since the 1960 campaign about U.S. prestige abroad. That was one of the main points of attack then against the Eisenhower administration. Its victim, Richard M. Nixon, refrained in his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors from discussing it last April. He felt that as the strongest nation in the world, it is our responsibility to lead, not to follow the forces of freedom.

But it is not the forces of freedom alone that are low on America today, it is the upstart nations encouraged by the Soviet Union's policy of aiding so-called wars of liberation. Look at Zanzibar, for instance, the latest in a number of tiny nations that has spat in Uncle Sam's eye with impunity.

The revolutionary President, Abeld Karume, personally led a group including his foreign minister and soldiery and put the highest American representative in the country, Frederick P. Picard, 3d, who was acting as chargé d'affaires, under house arrest. Then Karume placed Donald K. Peterson, a third secretary in the U.S. Embassy, also under house arrest, and detained the four American newsmen on the island. This was Karume's way of expressing his anger that the United States had not rushed to recognize his government. He released them 24 hours later.

There was also Prince Norodom Sihanouk, of Cambodia, who decided he wanted no more of the U.S. foreign aid, after riding the gravy train for many millions, and deciding that neutrality would serve his nation best while southeast Asia was a battleground. He

wants international guarantees of his country's neutrality similar to Laos, where Communists have continued their armed occupation of a large part of the country.

Closer to home, there was the burning and trampling on the American flag in the recent rioting in Panama definitely linked to Castro agents who appeared with bombs and rifles the minute that flag incident occurred.

Instead of worrying about U.S. prestige abroad, these and other incidents show that our concern should not be with what may be popular for the moment, but what is right for the United States in the long pull. Compromising our principles has brought the United States to a low estate indeed when such things can happen.

Older Than the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, we in Hartford, Conn., take great pride in being the home of the Hartford Courant, which this year observes its 200th anniversary. This makes the Hartford Courant the oldest newspaper in the United States, preceding, in fact, the independence of the Nation itself. Such continuity should not go unnoticed and indeed the publisher of *Time* magazine has caused it to be commented on in its March 13 issue. It is an interesting account of this historic event and I believe it should be called to the attention of the Members:

OLDER THAN THE COUNTRY

The news from Boston was sketchy and unconfirmed. Still, no newspaper that took pride in its independence could ignore it. So the Connecticut Courant, in Hartford, boldly displayed the item: "We hear from Boston that last Thursday evening, between 300 and 400 boxes of the celebrated East India tea, by some accident which happened in an attempt to get it on shore, fell overboard—that the boxes burst open and the tea was swallowed up by the vast abyss."

When that historical incident from America's past appeared in the Courant in the issue of December 21, 1773, the paper was already a veteran of 9 years. It had staked a proud and exclusive claim to a title that it still holds. This year the Hartford Courant observes its 200th anniversary, a chronological fact that makes it the oldest newspaper in the United States—an institution some 12 years senior to the Nation itself.

FARMS FOR LEASE

Today, American schoolchildren commit to memory the names, dates and events that the Courant once committed to print. In 1765 the paper published a wrathful editorial ("The most arbitrary monarchs in the universe") and suspended publication for five weeks to protest the Stamp Act just enforced by England. Thomas Paine's revolutionary tracts were carried in full in the Courant; so was the Declaration of Inde-

A title contested, with considerable spirit and flimsy documentation, by the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, which can trace its ancestry back to 1829—or 65 years after the Courant's birth.

pendence—on an inside page, and under the mildest of headlines: "A Declaration by the Representatives of the United States of America."

George Washington was not only the subject of Courant stories, he was a reader and advertiser. On March 14, 1796, he bought half a page in the paper to offer some of his Virginia farmland for lease to "real farmers of good reputation, and none others need apply." Thomas Jefferson sued the paper for libel after an 1806 Courant accusation that he had secretly bribed France to win its support. He lost his case in the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Courant's founder, a traveling printer named Thomas Green, piloted his paper for only three years. Then he rejoined a brother in New Haven, surrendering command of the Courant to Ebenezer Watson, one of his own printers. Young Watson enlisted the Courant in the cause of independence, but he did not live to see the dream come true or his paper prosper. Smallpox killed him during the Revolutionary War, leaving his young widow Hannah, mother of five, to manage the shop. She managed well. In 1778, when the Courant's paper mill burned to the ground, Hannah talked the Connecticut general assembly into sponsoring a statewide lottery, and from the proceeds (\$31,000) she was given \$5,000 to rebuild the mill.

The Courant continued to prosper, but in a diminishing corner of a rapidly expanding-national map. As soon as the Republican Party was founded in 1854, the Courant joined it, and has never left. The paper has since broken ranks to endorse only one Democrat for any office. It urged Hartford to elect Thomas Spellacy for mayor in 1935. The Courant's influence in its own balliwick can be measured by the fact that Spellacy was elected.

SATISFIED

Hartford and Connecticut now describe the horizon of a paper that in another century made compulsory reading for U.S. Presidents. Its causes have come to be on the parochial side. Where once it opposed women's suffrage, direct election of U.S. Senators and Franklin D. Roosevelt, now it fights for fluoridation and the council-manager plan. Where once it championed the right of the American Colonies to be free, today it opposes the right of a Hartford movie theater to eject the Courant's movie critic.

Wire services and syndicated columnists are relied on to report what goes on outside Connecticut. But in its own yard, the Courant can't be beat. In Willimantic, Old Saybrook, Simsbury and other familiar towns, the paper keeps up an industrious network of 13 bureaus, 25 staffers and more than 100 correspondents. One of the more dependable of these, Alice "Clover" Pinney, retired only last year after 54 straight years of covering Farmington, Conn., during which time she never missed a single fire.

NO MORE REVOLUTIONS

The Courant's present publisher, John R. Reitemeyer, 65, joined the paper as a part-time reporter in 1921, worked his patient way to the top by 1947, and has since addressed himself to the task of overtaking the afternoon competition, the Hartford Times.

A mere 147 years old, the Times is a Democratic daily in a Democratic city. It has led the Courant in circulation for 40 years, but the gap is closing again; circulation now is 128,500 to 124,000. In Reitemeyer's careful stewardship, the Courant is not likely to play a role in any more revolutions. It seems satisfied to remain the best paper in Hartford, Conn., and the oldest paper in the United States.

British Expert Terms Fat-Red Theory a False Basis for Trade With Cubans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, additional evidence is at hand that people in Western European countries who oppose trade giveaways and credit to Communist countries are speaking out to oppose their freewheeling governments on this issue.

The following article from the Washington Post, March 8, 1964, is an example of voices who are questioning the fallacies that fat Communists are nicer, that trade with Communist nations necessarily leads to political detente, or that expanded East-West trade can be independent of political factors.

These voices can help us budge the attitudes of West European politicians toward solid, needed trade curbs to Communist countries if we back them up. The administration is making a tragic error in not pushing hard enough. Its irresolute, halfway policy—sales of enormous quantities of wheat to the hard up Soviets, but timid scolding of the British for their Cuban bus sales—is a proven flop. We should get out and muster support from among the substantial body of Western European opinion which realizes the grim necessity of using trade as a political weapon against the Communist threat, in the same way that Communists would surely use trade against us if they had enough economic strength to do so. Let us not, as the administration is hinting, wreck our own trade controls simply because West European governments at the moment will not go along with stiff controls.

The article follows:

BRITISH EXPERT TERMS FAT-RED THEORY A
FALSE BASIS FOR TRADE WITH CUBANS

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON, March 8.—One of Britain's leading authorities on the Soviet Union took issue today with the thesis that a fat Communist was less dangerous than a lean one.

Writing in the London Sunday Times, Prof. Leonard Schapiro castigated both Prime Minister Douglas-Home and the Labor Party leader, Harold Wilson, for seeking to apply what he termed a fallacious argument to trade with Cuba.

To contend that the Soviet Union is more reasonable because it is fatter, Schapiro said, "attaches quite unreal importance to the relationship between what the population of Russia wants and the policy pursued by its leaders."

The overwhelming reason for discernible changes in Soviet policy, he contended, is the existence of nuclear weapons and the inadvisability of actions that might lead to armed conflict with the United States.

"No amount of trade with Cuba," he asserted, "is likely to produce the kind of factors which in the case of the Soviet Union may in time lead to closer and more harmonious political relations."

"On the other hand, to ignore the very natural apprehensions of our ally, the United States, about the shoring up of a power which is avowedly dedicated to spreading

Communist rule over the American continent, may lose us much more than we should ever gain from the profits of Cuban trade."

Schapiro did not exclude trade with Communist countries, but called for the weighing of political factors first. He opposed an economic boycott designed to starve Cuba on moral grounds.

"But quite apart from morals," he added, "the fact that the capitalist powers are repeatedly called upon to feed the Socialist countries is a more powerful argument against communism than all the books in the British Museum."

Schapiro's attack was the second made recently on the British fat versus lean Communist argument. Writing in the Guardian last week John Grigg, the former Lord Altrincham, took much the same line against what he called wishful thinking.

Are We Really Saving 25 Cents on the Dollar?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in the past the sole-source procurement of materiel by the Department of Defense has in some instances been much more expensive than it should have been. In many instances, competitive bidding would have resulted in a very definite saving to the taxpayer. Some of our colleagues have been diligent in determining such instances and pointing them out. However, to condemn the whole practice of sole-source procurement in all cases would not result in a net savings to the taxpayer. The fact that this important question must be solved with moderation and with an eye to the elements involved in each case is set forth very ably in this editorial by C. W. Borklund appearing in the Armed Forces Management magazine of January 1964. The editorial follows:

ARE WE REALLY SAVING 25 CENTS ON THE
DOLLAR?

(By C. W. Borklund)

Mr. Secretary, we don't buy your contention that you're saving 25 cents, at least, on every dollar converted from noncompetitive to competitive procurement. We don't say you are wrong. We just say you haven't proved it yet, and won't until you finish the story.

The key to whether you are correct or not revolves around the word "sound" in your expression "lowest sound price." This is an appropriate subject for an issue of Armed Forces Management loaded with reports on maintenance. These and related fields have a lot to do with our complaint.

Unless and until these factors are an integral part of your cost reduction analysis, your 25-cents-on-the-dollar figure is suspect. We have been harping on this soft spot for several months now. Latest indicator it probably still exists has come to us from Icar Siegler, vice president. R. W. Richardson summarizing a talk he gave late last year at a Navy-Industry seminar.

He wasn't necessarily indicting, as we are, your thesis, but he covered the subject extremely well. Here, in part, is what he had to say:

"Maintenance action—planned or unplanned, integrated or unintegrated—can only go to work on the product it receives from the procuring agency. If this product is a victim of what I call the low-bid fallacy then the best maintenance management in the world can only make a bad situation just a little less bad.

"We can and do use judgment in our personal procurements. (We know we can't afford to buy the cheapest bacon. It's mostly fat.) As individuals and as a nation we seem to be continually getting the terms 'cost' and 'price' confused in the defense business. . . . The fault is no one's and everyone's—a combination of contradiction and confusion, politics and pressures, idealism and insanity.

"Price equals acquisition dollars, or today's selling price haggled out in the bazaar.

"Cost equals total or ownership cost, or the combination of acquisition price plus cradle-to-grave support expense.

"For a long time . . . end-item procurement has been based largely on the low-bid criterion. Superficial savings are analyzed and awards made solely on this basis. The very important cost distinction between acquisition (and) ownership—a ratio of as much as 10 to 1—is neither considered nor encouraged. (Yet) if . . . price represents only one-tenth of total cost, surely total cost (is) the only valid (criterion for) procurement award. (In our personal affairs, I trust it would not occur to any of us to measure the cost of matrimony on the basis of the \$2 license fee.)

"Consider the recent procurement of a standard attitude indicator—a real small flea on the weapon system elephant. This indicator (bought from two sources) was designed and qualified to the same MIL spec, utilized by the same aircraft, maintained by the same people, flew the same missions throughout a 1-year period.

"Initially X-type indicators were priced at approximately \$3,000 each. Y-type, which was bid as a result of a breakout decision, had an initial price of \$2,000. However, (because Y cost three times as much to maintain as X) the support cost for keeping . . . brand X in the field for a 5-year period totals \$3,400,000 (while) Y has cost \$8,500,000. Extend this to cover a 10-year period, a reasonable life expectancy for the aircraft involved, and the difference is appalling.

"Then we have the situation where, in the name of economy and competitive bidding, one of the services decides to procure, on a second- or third-source basis, equipment that is substantially equal in maintenance cost. A case in point is a second-source procurement of 500 pieces of a \$1,000 component which showed a price saving of \$10,000 over the bid price of the original supplier. But the additional cost to introduce and support the second source was \$73,000—a net loss of \$63,000.

"Then on a repeat procurement for the same item yet a third vendor had the lowest quote. His bid was lower than those from the two prior sources by \$46,000 but the associated support cost to accept his product logistically was in excess of \$63,000. Again a net loss to the military—in this case \$20,000.

"So far the Government has saved a minus \$83,000 through the economies of a distorted misconception of competitive bidding. The only good thing you can say is that they are losing less for each new supplier they add. As the old saying goes, they only lose a little on each one but they make up for it in volume.

"Competition will exist in fact and true economy will be achieved only when the best product has been engineered and proven to meet the optimum combination of price and quality; when a fully comprehensive specification has been written and when all bidders are bound to guarantees of full compliance. After award there must be continuing